

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JUL 13 2007

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Applicant: Plow)	Art Unit: 3622
)	
Serial No.: 09/922,182)	Examiner: Myhre
)	
Filed: August 2, 2001)	STI.9-2000-0035-US1
)	
For: SYSTEM, METHOD, AND COMPUTER PROGRAM)	July 13, 2007
PRODUCT FOR STORING INTERNET)	750 B STREET, Suite 3120
ADVERTISEMENTS AT A USER COMPUTER)	San Diego, CA 92101
)	

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Dear Sir:

This responds to the Office Action dated July 11, 2007, which was precipitated by a remand from the Board dated February 10, 2006, ordering the examiner to give the application "immediate attention", Remand, bottom of page 4. As part of the next Office Action an explanation for the examiner's failure to conform to the order of the Board is required. The SPE, if not the TCD, should countersign the explanation.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, and 13-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by LeMole et al., USPN 6,009,410.

1. The rejection of Claim 1 fails to mention the limitation of an advertising history window displaying Internet content composed of plural advertisements, nor do any of the cited sections of the reference mention one. The closest the rejection comes to alleging that the recited limitation is in the reference is in paragraph "c" on page 4 of the Office Action, alleging that col. 5, lines 23-27 of LeMole et al. teaches

1176-3.AM5